

Santa Rosa County
Local Mitigation Strategy (LMS) Task Force
Steering Committee
November 13, 2008
Milton, Florida

The Santa Rosa County LMS Task Force met on the above date. A copy of the sign-in sheet showing attendees is attached in the file. Hunter Walker called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

Review and approval of minutes for previous meeting held 08/05/08. R. Royals moved approval as submitted, motion seconded and carried unanimously.

Attendees welcomed Joy Duperault, State Mitigation Planner, by introducing themselves.

D. Hahn introduced J. Duperault. He explained that he and S. Harris attended a meeting in Escambia County and determined that Escambia was a bit ahead of Santa Rosa County. J. Duperault reviews the LMS plans for the State of Florida. It was determined that the best way for us to meet her expectations would be for her to attend this meeting and tell us exactly what her requirements are.

J. Duperault explained that our mitigation strategy is a template for our community to strengthen itself against future disasters. It is not mandatory. However, you would want to participate because there is money attached to it. FEMA requires us to maintain the plan; it must be in place and approved if we expect to receive any of the money. In many instances it is a lot of money. If Santa Rosa County would like any of the money made available through a Hazard Mitigation Grant after a disaster, and in some instances, before a disaster, they must have a plan in place. There are nine (9) disaster programs total. There are currently sixty-seven (67) approved plans in the state of Florida. There were instances after disasters where some counties had their plans in place but did not have final approval due to one thing or another. In those instances they were unable to collect any of the money after the disaster.

The state's plan expires every three (3) years and the county's plan expires every five (5) years. Santa Rosa County's plan will expire on May 5, 2010.

All three (3) jurisdictions within Santa Rosa County participate in the plan and are represented on this committee. They include Gulf Breeze, Jay, and Milton. Others can apply through our local plan such as universities and colleges but they can also have their own strategy. Municipalities must be a part of this particular plan though, to access the funding. The main purpose to update or change a plan is to reflect changes in the development, progress in the mitigation efforts, or changes in our priorities. Examples were provided to this committee.

There is an annual update to these lists of mitigation measures which is part of the Florida Rule #9G22. If you do participate in updating this list, it makes it easier to maintain.

In reviewing terminology, J. Duperrault explained that crosswalk is a tool utilized to follow the mandates under 44CFR. This tells the planner where in the plan that person can find the answers to the specific FEMA questions.

D. Szymanski asked whether other types of special districts can participate such as fire districts. J. Duperrault stated that everyone should be invited. However, it should be a town with a mayor, a city with a city council, etc. Some colleges and universities are included. They can be included as part of that city or town and it is advantageous for them to participate at the table. They will learn more about mitigation at their own facilities, especially if those facilities are used as shelters. To that point, as a part of the update, you need to indicate who was invited and who attended.

D. Hahn noted that Pensacola Junior College crosses jurisdiction; they have two major campuses in Escambia County and one in Santa Rosa County. J.

Duperrault will check to see where they would participate. The address of the mitigation site will probably determine where they would participate.

The requirements are essentially each element of the 44CFR ruling such as 'does your plan document your planning process?' The elements break down the requirements into component parts. The Guidance that was provided to you tells you exactly what FEMA wants, e.g. shall = must, should is optional, but highly recommended!

Who Needs to be at the Table?

This is an open public involvement process. The process is just as important to FEMA as the plan itself. Listings, rosters, logs, minutes, invitations, newspaper notifications, etc. must be maintained as you go along and should be included in the index. Only one copy is necessary for submission. If the people choose not to attend, the documentation will indicate that they were no less included.

Participants might include many invitees including county and city planners, LMS working group members, EM staff, public officials, flood managers, critical structures proprietors such as schools, hospitals, LE, fire departments, agencies, businesses and organizations, John Q. Public and other stakeholders. These groups can communicate their needs and make the plan and the community that much stronger due to the fact that they all have different perspectives.

In order to accomplish this, the update team will need to utilize some of the following available tools:

- FEMA's Local Multi-hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance (July, 2008)
- FEMA's Crosswalk tool and matrices in the planning area
- State planners & technical assistance
- Local, City and County regional planners
- Other current related plans (COMP, CEMP, Coastal Improvement Plan, floodplain plan, coastal management plans, etc.)
- Possible funding

Since Santa Rosa County's plan is due to expire May, 2010. The draft for review would be due to the state planner in November, 2009. The state will review and make suggestions for improvement prior to submitting to FEMA at least four (4) months prior to expiration date. FEMA would actually prefer six (6) months prior to expiration date.

D. Szymanski asked whether J. Duperault would be critiquing Santa Rosa's plan. J. Duperault advised she would not be reviewing the plan. She did, however, suggest that we review ours closely, page by page and line by line! She suggested that we do not remove any historical maps and data; you do not want to remove identified hazards. Check for errors!

J. Duperault will advise which changes have taken place within the plans since ours was approved. FEMA will compare the new plan to the old plan. Any portion of the plan that is marginally approved is noted in the Crosswalk. When both SRC LMS working group and the state planner is satisfied with the plan it will be submitted to FEMA four (4) months prior to the expiration date. Jurisdictions can adopt the plan only after FEMA has 'approved pending adoption.'

In order to develop a strategy and a timeline for working together toward a finalized plan you need to decide how you plan to work. You might form a task force for each issue, e.g. floods, or you might undertake the whole project and wade through each of the issues. Some of the tools for accomplishing the task include:

- State mitigation planners
- Hazard toolbox
- HAZUS-MH risk assessment software
- Regional Planning Council staff
- FEMA publications/training
- (Memphis software has been suspended indefinitely)
- Consultants
- Subcommittees

D. Hahn stated that he has had maps updated for the CEMP by GIS and Planning & Zoning and, in turn, plans to use those maps for the LMS plan. J. Duperault stated that integrating the plans works out very well!

Some important things to remember is that the plan updates must demonstrate that progress has been made in the past 5 years. We must indicate that we do what we said we would do! Now is the time to review that these issues have been completed. There must be valid reasons for those things that have not been completed.

The community's involvement must be captured within the plan; a description of how the community was kept involved during the *plan maintenance* process over the previous five years needs to be included. The LM plan must document how

each jurisdiction that is requesting approval of the plan participated in the planning process itself.

D. Hahn asked whether the FEMA Guidance allows residents from the community to attend the meetings. J. Duperault stated that FEMA highly endorses that type of activity and welcomes it. They might even want to know *why that type of activity does not exist*, and will be pleased to learn that it does occur.

S. Harris asked for examples of types of activities that FEMA might endorse other than the LMS meetings. Examples provided include:

- Any type of mitigation that is accomplished ahead of time renders less loss
- Any integration with other existing plans, including reaching out to homeowners, cities, floodplain loss, etc.
- Publicize workshops for in order for the public to participate
- Make sand and sand bags available to the public prior to an incident

S. Furman stated that on the Public Works side drainage has been enhanced in many areas of the county.

J. Duperault stated that we would not be criticized for including things that actually took place after the fact. Her example is an evacuation study. She stated that evacuation is **not** mitigation; however, evacuation can best be learned by studying what transpired in the community. Evacuation signs are not considered mitigation. Another activity that is ineligible is beach re-nourishment even though it re-establishes a buffer zone. The local DEP's coastal management plan will have some ideas for mitigation verbiage, e.g. dune vegetation management. The Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) lists some mitigation activities. We may have actually done some of the activities and not yet listed them as part of the LM plan.

Once again, FEMA wants to know how each jurisdiction (Milton, Jay, Navarre, Gulf Breeze) participated. They want to know how you reviewed the plan. Who participated in reviewing, how did you review the plan, did a task force review the plan, did you review parts of the plan or the whole plan, how did you analyze the plan, was an update necessary, if not, why not?

The hazards I.D./risk assessment portion of the plan will need to be updated. We must add or update anything that occurred since the date of the current plan. Added tornadoes, hurricanes, sinkholes, etc., added new buildings to the community made us more vulnerable. You must also list any actions that reduced overall vulnerability. Laura Herbert, SERT, is good with these types of questions.

If, in our current plan, we stated that we did not have enough data about an issue, FEMA will expect that we have the data for this plan or a reason why we do not have the data yet. If anything was not available, unresolved, or insufficient in the previous plan, it must be addressed in this plan.

Santa Rosa County's Repetitive Loss Properties list is very large but it is believed that it will be cut in half (hopefully mitigated!) for the updated plan. Changes to the items listed must be addressed in this plan.

All National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) issues such as the community rating system must also be addressed in the plan.

Critical Structures need to be updated, new power grids, new bridges, etc. Basically an updated inventory of all structures must be provided in the plan to include communication systems and networks, high potential loss facilities, historic, cultural & natural resources areas, etc. We are unable to include I-10 as a new bridge as it is federal property. The state will not provide funding for mitigation on federal property.

FEMA wants to see the risk and vulnerability for each jurisdiction. The effects of the damage to I-10 did have an effect on our risk and vulnerability and should be mentioned in the plan.

D. Hahn mentioned that three employees will be attending HAZUS training and was advised that this type of information should also be included in the plan. Each jurisdiction has to address their own vulnerabilities separate from the general planning area, and they have to present a specific list of mitigation measures for their jurisdiction.

Mitigation strategy includes your goals and objectives. If they are exactly the same, you must state just that. You must include an explanation if no changes are made. The likelihood is that some things will change. R. Royals stated that over the years this committee has tried to include different businesses, groups or agencies such as Air Products, the Chambers of Commerce, and even local schools. She questioned whether other jurisdictions have the same problem getting these groups to participate or become more involved. J. Duperault said that it depends on each of the counties. Some communities do a lot of training, some do a lot of public education about mitigation and then it just fits well. It was stated that if a member of this committee attended a Chamber breakfast there would most likely be an audience of approximately one hundred people. The mitigation goals tend to be broader than the objectives. Your objectives are more specific and measurable. Your goals and objectives should be re-evaluated in order to reduce your risk and vulnerability.

All plans approved by FEMA after October 1, 2008 must describe each jurisdiction's participation in the NFIP and must identify, analyze and prioritize your actions related to continued compliance with the NFIP. FEMA will look for the Activity 500 within the plan. In addition, communities are encouraged to undertake additional activities that go above and beyond the minimum requirements of NFIP participation.

Mitigation Actions Update

Any changes to mitigation measures included in the previous plan and any new mitigation actions must be identified through the plan update process. You must identify whether they were completed, deleted or deferred and provide a reason for each. These items are usually updated on an annual basis, which makes it easier to include in the updated plan.

If multi-jurisdictional, then must link each action to the individual jurisdictions. You would only have to indicate which jurisdiction each item refers to. Must also include the following within the plan:

HOW	How actions will be implemented and administered
WHO	The jurisdiction and department responsible for carrying out the actions
WHAT-\$\$\$	The potential funding sources
WHEN	The implementation timeline

This section should include a budget for each item. However, most use one ballpark figure when available.

Plan Maintenance

The updated plan maintenance must include the method and schedule to be used over the next five years to monitor, evaluate and update the plan; just as the previously approved plan identified those same procedures.

Integration with Existing Plans

It is very important that the updated plan be integrated with existing plans for the community. The updated plan must explain how the mitigation plan is incorporated into other planning mechanisms as a demonstration of progress in local mitigation efforts throughout the community. This weaves the plans together and allows for greater communication.

Crosswalk & Matrices

Both the Crosswalk and matrices are tools to assist in the review of the plans. The Crosswalk is based on the Guide and each element must be responded to satisfactorily for overall plan approval. The matrices will assist with sections on profiling hazards, assessing vulnerability, and identifying and analyzing mitigation actions.

The state will review and make remarks or label as unsatisfactory. FEMA will only approve the plan when every section meets their requirements.

Ready-Set-Go!

- Take a deep breath and stretch
- Create sub-committees or teams to address the different sections
- Set a timeline for workshops and whole group meetings
- Dig in, be diligent and ask for help when needed

Updating the Local Mitigation Strategy Plan – end
Joy Duperault, Mitigation Planner, (850) 922-4518,
joy.duperault@em.myflorida.com

LMS Plan – 5 Year Update

D. Hahn stated that there are committees involved with the review. D. Hahn has been working on reviewing for typographical types of errors made by the consultant and is about one-quarter through the plan at this time. He has been working with S. Bracewell and L. Green utilizing the Microsoft Office Live program as a tool. Users can be invited to view the document simultaneously. Everyone will be invited and will be able to see what changes have been made to the plan. This will be sent to committee members as soon as possible.

Revised LMS Project Priority List / Prioritization Methods

S. Harris stated that it is important to determine whether a specific LMS Task Force should be established. It would be advantageous to set a date for a meeting. D. Hahn stated that the Guidance for this plan was approved over the phone. D. Hahn mentioned that a group worked on restructuring the Flood Plain plan, to be reviewed by a separate group of supervisors. He suggests that the same group take on the whole task and integrate what was adopted in the Flood Plain plan into the LMS plan, which is part of our overall goal.

L. Green explained Microsoft Office Live to the committee and noted that everyone's changes, comments, or remarks would be visible to each other. It helps to eliminate emailing entire text files.

J. Duperault reminded this committee to include an explanation of this very helpful process in the plan itself.

S. Harris will contact those few not in attendance to assure their participation.

H. Walker advised this committee to at least start meeting before the December holidays.

Some discussion ensued. The meeting will be set up through Outlook Express. S. Harris has received most jurisdictions' prioritization updates to the current project list. She will need to address the balance of those and then prioritize the combined project lists from each jurisdiction. D. Hahn suggested that everyone take a copy and come to the table at the next scheduled meeting ready to determine a method of prioritizing the lists.

S., Harris provided updates for some of the projects to the committee. She had previously advised this committee of a regular repetitive loss workshop for homeowners. Thirteen homeowners out of twenty-three did attend. Three applications were completed and met the qualifications. She must send in a task timeline and scheduled work. Establishing the task force will help to eliminate duplication of work.

H. Walker questioned whether the Flood Plain plan did, in fact, become a part of the LMS plan. His concern is a duplication of time and effort. It was determined that it will become a part of the LMS plan. S. Harris stated that the Flood Plain plan will have to be an independent plan due to the grant funding; however it can become a part of the LMS plan. J. Duperault suggested that it be included as an appendix.

H. Walker reiterated that we should keep our eyes open and use our good judgment; in some instances a grant could be more effort than it's worth.

Sandra Woodbery, Rebuild NW Florida

S. Woodbery provided an update on the progress within Santa Rosa County. Rebuild NWF has passed their 2000th house being mitigated. Santa Rosa County funds were a bit smaller; the plan was to complete greater than one hundred (100) homes with the mitigation funds and they completed only one hundred (100). Their Scope of Work was revised to indicate that they would not exclude any economic group. Consequently, they are mitigating low, moderate and high income housing at this time. One feature that had the greatest impact in Santa Rosa County was the high percentage of roof to roof deck attachments increased the costs to more than \$1,000 per house. We have completed seventy-one (71) homes and are in the process of completing twenty-one (21) additional homes in Santa Rosa County. Rebuild NWF intended to be completed by the end of 2008 calendar year. The biggest source of cash-match projects came from My Safe Florida Home program. There was a 30 day delay in obtaining the funds for these projects but they still hope to be done by the end of the year. Rebuild NW Florida did provide a GIS map of all of the homes within Santa Rosa County that they plan to have completed.

Meeting adjourned.

Special task force meeting to be held prior to the next regular meeting

Next regular meeting to be held:

February 5, 2009

